



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,817	08/31/2001	Gene Golovchinsky	FXPL-01001US0	2360
23910	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/944,817	GOLOVCHINSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 and 41-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-39 and 41-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 5 December 2005, to the original application, filed 31 August 2001.
2. The rejection of claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
3. The rejection of claims 1-9, 14-15, 24, 26, 38-40, 42-43, 51, and 53-54 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. The rejection of claims 10, 16-20, 41, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
5. The rejection of claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,641,058 B1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. The rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) and Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,641,058 B1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. The rejection of claims 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) and Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. The rejection of claims 25, 27, 31, 33, 36-37, 45, and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. The rejection of claims 28, 30, 44, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Bays (U.S.

Publication 2003/0018632 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. The rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1) and Stern (U.S. Patent 6,572,661 B1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. The rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1) and Stern (U.S. Patent 6,572,661 B1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. The rejection of claims 34-35, 46-47 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1) and Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2176

13. Claims 1-39 and 41-56 are pending. Claim 56 was mistakenly listed as an independent claim in the previous Office action, and independent claim 51 was mistakenly omitted from the listing as an independent. The Office thanks Applicant for noting this in the Instant Amendment. Claims 1, 39, and 51 are independent claims.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-39 and 41-56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-15, 26, 38-39, 42, 51, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729).

As per claims 1, 5, 39, and 51, Reber discloses a system and method for detecting an indication in a document or documents stored in a processor-readable storage medium (See Reber, Column 8, lines 24-32) including code for locating an

indication in the document (See Reber, Column 9, lines 35-38), code for detecting, close to or within the indication, an anchor (See Reber, Column 9, lines 39-46), where the processor-readable storage medium communicates the first code and the second code to a processor to detect the indicated anchor in the document (See Reber, Column 9, lines 39-46) and to perform at least one process on the indicated anchor, such as storing a portion of the information (See Reber, Column 9, lines 53-55). While Reber does not disclose expressly an annotation to the document, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conclude that the indication, or mark, of Reber is equivalent to the annotation of the Instant Invention. The motivation for such a conclusion would have been to allow the user of the Reber system to select the resources on a document, such as URLs, by making a mark within a designated boundary in close proximity to the resource (See Reber, Column 9, lines 36-52).

As per claim 2, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Reber also discloses that the detecting code detects an anchor that represents an explicit link to at least one other location (See Reber, Column 4, lines 25-27).

As per claim 3, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Reber also discloses that the detecting code detects an anchor that represents an implicit link to at least one other location (See Reber, Column 4, lines 44-53).

As per claim 4, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Reber also discloses a data structure referencing the annotated anchor (See Reber, Column 8, lines 24-27).

As per claim 6, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Reber also discloses that the processing code includes generating a data structure including the annotated anchor (See Reber, Column 9, lines 64-67, and Column 10, lines 1-8).

As per claim 7, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Reber also discloses that the data structure includes a number of annotated anchors (See Reber, Column 10, lines 19-32).

As per claim 8, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Reber also discloses that the number of annotated anchors are obtained from at least one document (See Reber, Column 9, lines 35-38).

As per claim 9, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Reber also discloses that the number of annotated anchors in the data structure are displayed in a format (See Reber, Figure 6, and Column 11, lines 62-67).

As per claim 11, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Reber also discloses that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to annotated anchor metadata (See Reber, Column 11, lines 62-67).

As per claim 12, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchors each represent a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 15-22), where the annotated anchor metadata includes a number of anchors within the document representing the target (See Reber, Column 9, lines 35-38).

As per claims 14 and 42, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 9 and 39 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchors each represent a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22), where the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to target data (See Reber, Figure 6, and Column 11, lines 62-67).

As per claims 15 and 53, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 14 and 51 as described above. Reber also discloses that the target is a second document (See Reber, Column 12, lines 9-17).

As per claim 26, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least a second document (See Reber, Column 4, lines 15-22, and Figure 2), where the processing code includes obtaining the second document (See Reber, Column 12, lines 18-23).

As per claim 38, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22), where the processing code includes displaying the annotated anchor and the target (See Reber, Column 12, lines 9-23).

16. Claims 10, 16-17, 41, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) as applied to claims 9, 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1).

As per claims 10, 41, and 52, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 9, 39, and 51 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly displaying the annotated anchors according to annotation metadata. Wright discloses displaying anchors according to metadata or attributes, such as color, size or shape. (See Wright, Abstract, and Page 1, paragraph 10). Reber and Wright are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a user in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the formatted display of Wright with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wright with Reber for the benefit of allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10, 41, and 52.

As per claims 16 and 17, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly adding the annotated anchor to a data structure based on at least one attribute value. Wright discloses code which includes adding anchors or hyperlinks to a data structure based on at least one attribute, and that the data structure has a number of hyperlinks that have at least one attribute value. (See Wright, Abstract). Reber and Wright are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data organization by attribute of Wright with the

Art Unit: 2176

system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wright with Reber for the benefit of allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 16 and 17.

17. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1), as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1).

As per claims 18-20, Reber and Wright disclose the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Reber and Wright do not disclose expressly that the annotated anchors have at least one attribute value. Carro discloses including the position of the marked or annotated item (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Wright also discloses that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors or hyperlinks according to the annotation metadata or attributes. (See Wright, Abstract, and Page 1, paragraph 0010). Reber, Wright and Carro are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the position attribute of Carro with the system and method of Reber and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify the information

and/or service associated with the position of the selected marked item (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the data organization by attribute of Wright with the system and method of Reber and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest (See Wright, Page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wright and Carro with Reber and Wright for the benefit of identifying the information and/or service associated with the position of the selected marked item and allowing a user to effectively and quickly pick out information or items of interest to obtain the invention as specified in claims 18-20.

18. Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) and Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1), as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per claims 22-23, Reber, Wright and Carro disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchors which have at least one attribute value each represent a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22). Reber, Wright and Carro do not disclose expressly that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors which have at least one attribute value according to target metadata. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchors of Reber,

Carro and Wright as described above each represent a link to at least one target and where the format includes displaying the annotated anchors according to the target metadata. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraphs 0039-0040). Reber, Carro, Wright and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a user in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the displaying of annotated anchors according to target metadata of Ingram with the system and method of Reber, Carro and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable users to activate the hyperlink at any time (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber, Carro and Wright for the benefit of enabling users to activate the hyperlink at any time to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

As per claim 23, Reber, Wright, Carro and Ingram disclose the limitations of claim 22 as described above. Reber also discloses that the target is a second document (See Reber, Column 12, lines 9-17).

19. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Wright (U.S. Publication 2002/0091679 A1) and Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Patent 6,651,058 B1).

As per claim 21, Reber, Carro and Wright disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Reber, Carro and Wright do not disclose expressly that the format includes displaying the annotated anchors which have at least one attribute value according to annotated anchor metadata. Sundaresan discloses associating hyperlinks according to their metadata. (See Sundaresan, Column 8, lines 63-67, and Column 9, lines 1-8). Once hyperlinks are associated by their metadata, it would be inherently obvious to display the hyperlinks using this associated format. Reber, Carro, Wright and Sundaresan are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the metadata association of Sundaresan with the system and method of Reber, Carro and Wright. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with access to information which is related by relevance to a particular topic or set of attributes as is contained within a document's metadata and to reduce the number of reoccurring documents. (See Sundaresan, Column 3, lines 37-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sundaresan with Reber, Carro and Wright for the benefit of improved data organization to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

20. Claims 13, 24, 43, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) as applied to claims 5, 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1).

As per claim 13, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly a number of annotated anchors representing a target. Carro discloses a number of marks associated with a target (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Reber and Carro are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the number of marks associated with a target of Carro with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to indicate the position of multiple links within a hyperlink table by selecting marks located within a defined boundary (See Carro, Page 4, paragraph 0055). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Carro with Reber for the benefit of allowing a user to indicate the position of multiple links within a hyperlink table by selecting marks located within a defined boundary to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13,

As per claims 24, 43 and 54, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 39 and 51 as described above. Reber also discloses that at least one of the annotated anchors represent a link to a second document (See Reber, Column 4, lines 15-22, and Figure 2). Reber does not disclose expressly determining whether the second document is stored in the system. Carro discloses determining whether the second document is stored in the system (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080) and obtaining the second document if it is not already stored (See Carro, Page 5, paragraph 0071). Reber and Carro are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the determination as to whether the second document is stored in the system of Carro with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to access an existing document as referenced within the hyperlink table (See Carro, Page 6, paragraph 0080-0081). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Carro with Reber for the benefit of allowing a user to access an existing document as referenced within the hyperlink table to obtain the invention as specified in claims 24, 43 and 54.

21. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Carro (U.S. Publication 2001/0056439 A1) as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per claim 25, Reber and Carro disclose the limitations of claim 24 as described above. Reber also discloses that the document contains a second annotated anchor representing a link to at least a second target (See Reber, Column 10, lines 19-32). Reber and Carro do not disclose expressly locating at least a second document that includes a reference to the first and second targets in the second document. Ingram discloses including a reference to the first and second targets in subsequent documents (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Ingram discloses that the hyperlink, or anchor, is within a second document (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber, Carro and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor

Art Unit: 2176

of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the reference to the first and second targets within subsequent documents of Ingram with the system and method of Reber and Carro. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the user to return to the page of origination (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber and Carro for the benefit of enabling the user to return to the page of origination to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

22. Claims 27, 31-33, 36-37, 45, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) as applied to claims 26, 5, and 39 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per claim 27, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 26 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly obtaining the second document prior to a reader requesting the second document. Ingram discloses obtaining documents prior to a user's request for the documents and enabling access to the documents by adding items representing the documents to a taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the obtaining documents prior to a user's request for the documents of Ingram

Art Unit: 2176

with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable users to view the page referenced by the hyperlink at any given time (See Ingram, Pages 2-3, paragraph 0040). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of enabling users to view the page referenced by the hyperlink at any given time to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

As per claims 31 and 45, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22). Reber does not disclose expressly suppressing a display of the second anchor. Ingram discloses suppressing a display of a second anchor by taking a snapshot of the anchor, or hyperlink, and including the anchor or hyperlink reference on a taskbar (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of the second anchor of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 31 and 45.

As per claim 32, Reber and Ingram disclose the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Reber also discloses that the second anchor is within the document (See Reber, Figure 1, elements 32 and 34, and Column 5, lines 50-54).

As per claim 33, Reber and Ingram discloses the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Reber also discloses that the document contains a second annotated anchor representing a link to at least a second target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22). Reber does not disclose expressly locating at least a second document that includes a reference to the first and second targets in the second document. Ingram discloses including a reference to the first and second targets in subsequent documents (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Ingram discloses that the hyperlink, or anchor, is within a second document (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the reference to the first and second targets within subsequent documents of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the user to return to the page of origination (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of enabling the user to return to the page of origination to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

As per claims 36 and 48, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 5 and 39 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly identifying a node representing

the target and suppressing a display of the node. Ingram discloses identifying, in the hypertext structure, a node representing the target and suppressing a display of the node, allowing the reader to see only an item listed in the taskbar. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of a node of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 36 and 48.

As per claims 37 and 49, Reber and Ingram disclose the limitations of claims 36 and 48 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, an object representing the link and suppressing a display of the object. (See Ingram, Page 4, paragraph 0054). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the suppression of the display of an object of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 37 and 49.

As per claim 50, Reber discloses the limitations of claim 39 as described above. Reber does not disclose expressly displaying simultaneously the annotated anchor and the target. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes displaying the annotated anchor and the target. (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0047). Reber and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the simultaneous display of the anchor and the target of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide for the user an easy one click method for returning to the page of origin (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0050). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber for the benefit of providing the user with an easy one click method for returning the page of origin to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

23. Claims 28, 44, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) as applied to claims 5, 39, and 51 above, and further in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1).

As per claims 28, 44, and 55, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 5, 39 and 51 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target and that the code includes detecting a second anchor representing a link to the target. (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22, and Figure 2). Reber does not disclose expressly propagating the annotation to the second anchor. Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Reber and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the propagation of annotations to other data items of Bays with the annotated anchor representing a second target of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bays with Reber for the benefit of associating by annotation related items to obtain the invention as specified in claims 28, 44 and 55.

As per claim 29, Reber and Ingram disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Reber also discloses that the second anchor is within the document (See Reber, Figure 1, elements 32 and 34, and Column 5, lines 50-54).

24. Claims 30 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reber (U.S. Patent 5,903,729) in view of Bays (U.S. Publication 2003/0018632 A1)

as applied to claims 28 and 46 above, and further in view of Ingram (U.S. Publication 2002/0052890 A1).

As per claim 30, Reber and Bays disclose the limitations of claim 28 as described above. Reber and Bays do not disclose expressly locating at least a second document that includes a reference to the first and second targets in the second document. Ingram discloses including a reference to the first and second targets in subsequent documents (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Ingram discloses that the hyperlink, or anchor, is within a second document (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Reber, Bays, and Ingram are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of assisting a reader in accessing, displaying and organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the reference to the first and second targets within subsequent documents of Ingram with the system and method of Reber and Bays. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable the user to return to the page of origination (See Ingram, Page 3, paragraph 0041). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber and Bays for the benefit of enabling the user to return to the page of origination to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30.

As per claims 34, 46, and 56, Reber discloses the limitations of claims 5, 39 and 51 as described above. Reber also discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target (See Reber, Column 4, lines 14-22). Reber does not disclose expressly propagating the annotation to the node. Ingram discloses that the annotated anchor represents a link to at least one target, and that the code includes

identifying, in a hypertext structure, a node representing the target. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0040). Bays discloses that annotations may be written to other data items. (See Bays, Page 6, paragraph 0081). Reber, Ingram, and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the propagation of annotations to other data items of Bays and the annotated anchor representing a second target of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate similar items by propagating the annotations to these related items. (See Bays, Page 2, paragraph 0017). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bays and Ingram with Reber for the benefit of associating by annotation related items to obtain the invention as specified in claims 34, 46 and 56.

As per claim 35 and 47, Reber, Ingram, and Bays disclose the limitations of claims 34 and 46 as described above. Ingram also discloses that the code includes identifying, in the hypertext structure, a connecting object representing the link, such as a graphic element, and altering the connecting object, such as reducing it's size. (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Reber, Ingram, and Bays are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of organizing electronic data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the identification, in the hypertext structure, of a connecting object representing the link, and alteration of the connecting object, such as a reduction in size, of Ingram with the system and method of Reber. The motivation for doing so would have been to take full

advantage of the viewable area on the display (See Ingram, Page 2, paragraph 0039). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ingram with Reber, Ingram and Bays for the benefit of taking full advantage of the viewable area on the display to obtain the invention as specified in claims 35 and 47.

Conclusion

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
2/15/2006